

2010. Peterson

EVIL

REPLY
TO THE
EVIDENCES OF THE DELUSIONS
OF
HOMŒOPATHY,

BY
J. C. PETERSON, M. D.,
AUTHOR OF "HOMŒOPATHY DEMONSTRATED."

SAINT JOHN, N. B.:
PUBLISHED BY EDWARD WILLIS & CO.
1857.

THOSI
HOM
G

RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED

TO

THOSE GENTLEMEN WHO ASKED THE QUESTION--"IS
HOMŒOPATHY AN ESTABLISHED SCIENCE, OR A
GERMAN SCHEME TO CATCH THE CREDULOUS?"

AND TO

THE PATRONS OF HOMŒOPATHY IN ST. JOHN.

PREFACE.

No one asked us to write this pamphlet. We do it on our own individual responsibility. Homœopathy has been traduced and grossly misrepresented. We appear to defend it. We have had a hard task. Satire and ridicule give but few points of argument, and but slightly injure the system. In fact, we may state that the "Evidences" have been doing a good work, for we speak the truth when we state that since it was issued we have been consulted by nine patients who have been induced to test Homœopathy by reading Dr. B's production. A fact, flattering to both Dr. Bayard and ourselves. Flattering to him that he has had nine readers, and, to us, that we have them for patients.

We have made extensive quotations from Professor Henderson. It could not be avoided, as Dr. B. quotes entirely from Simpson.

Hoping all who read the "Delusion" will give attention to the opposite side of the question, we leave the Reply in the hands of an intelligent community to judge of the relative merits of the two rival systems of medicine.

The year of grace 1857, has been already celebrated for two expected catastrophes, which, however, did not take place.

1st. The Comet of Charles V. was to knock the world into small pieces, on the 16th June last. The world still survives the expected collision.

2nd. The "Evidences of the Delusions of Homœopathy by R. Bayard, M.D., D.C.L.," was to quash Homœopathy during the same month. So we were to have that system of delusions destroyed without doubt. If the fatal comet left any stray infinitesimals upon the fragments of earth the "Evidences" would finish them—Homœopathy still survives!

PADDOCK STREET, }
June, 1857. }

Dr
nition
same
itesin
Tont
Arith
the D
opath
implied
examp
sensat
mits, i
the it
again
mann
self on
Mesme
of his
we ca
and a
the def
The
"Hom
the wil
the abu
facts fo
B

REPLY

TO THE

DELUSIONS OF HOMŒOPATHY.

Dr. Bayard commences his *immense sneer* by a concise definition of "credulity" and "superstition," and concludes the same with a long article in reference to the indicator. "Infinite Spiritualities," "Mesmerism," "Amulets," "Royal Tonteto," and "Table Turning," all dished up with a little Arithmetic, to complete the anticipated "Evidences of the Delusions of Homœopathy." He cites the Homœopathic law of "*Similia similibus curantur*," and says, it implies that likes are cured by likes, and illustrates it by the example that, "Itch is cured by remedies which excite the sensation of itching and the desire of scratching." He admits, it seems, in the outset, the truth of the *law* as regards the itch, and we would naturally expect some argument against the Homœopathic law, this "aphorism of Hahnemann;" but strange to say, none appears, and he loses himself on the second page, by giving us a long article on Mesmerism. We have nothing to do with Mesmer, or any of his isms; but if Dr. B. wish discussion upon that subject, we can point out an Allopathic Physician of this city—and a leading man too—who will take up the cudgel for the defence.

The Doctor makes extensive extracts from Prof. Simpson's "Homœopathy, its tenets and tendencies," and assumes all the wild statements found therein, as evidential truths, all the abuse and slander as sparkling wit, and all the distorted facts for plain and naked truth. Prof. Henderson attended

to the tenets in Edinburgh with such success that we will refer to him in replying to the Simpsonian extracts.

While alluding to Professor Simpson's work we may as well relate a peculiar circumstance in connection with it. An Allopathic Physician of this city gave a copy of it to an intelligent lady, one of his patrons, to read. She attentively perused its pages and, like unto its grandchild, "The Evidences," she could find nothing but sarcasm and sneers, and, therefore, concluded that there must be something in the system which was so traduced, and having no particular love for Allopathy, she determined to test Homœopathy whenever the opportunity occurred, which she did to her satisfaction; so much so, that Allopathy has crossed the threshold of her house for the last time. She now places all confidence in "infinitesimal spiritualities and globuleism."

Now to the wonderful sermon of the Rev. Thomas Everest, upon Homœopathy. That individual sermon should, by this time, be worn out. All Allopathy, from Professors Simpson and Holloway down to Dr. Bayard, have copied and re-copied, until it is decidedly nauseating—and to prove what? Nothing more than that the Rev. Gentleman was an ass. Suppose he was; how in the name of common sense is this fact to affect the Homœopathic law of cure? How is this to prove, as our author wishes it, the system a delusion? But let us see if Allopathy cannot manufacture a religion peculiar to itself.

"The great organ, interpreter and law-giver of all Allopathic physic, the British and Foreign Medical Review, not content with the apotheosis of any single individual, puts all the members of all the Colleges of Physicians, and all the graduates of the Universities (invidiously omitting the Surgeons) into the supernal calender. 'The physician,' quotes the oracle, 'cannot but be impressed with the dignity of his pursuits; he cannot conceal from himself *that his mission is to ameliorate the primal curse; that he is the special messenger of Providence to suffering man.*' But this is not all—

the
path
imp
writ
De
is G
Mac
gods

Sc
"lov
opath
of th
porti

On
disco
He le

Dr
the f
yet i
estab
has m
agent

"P
were,
them
Virgi
and d
physic
Hoffm
(bad
thoug
but in
est,' s
suspens

* He
† In
whose

the lofty estimate which Hippocrates entertained of Allopathic doctors is complacently appropriated thus: 'It is impossible to peruse the ethical portions of the Hippocratic writings without *feeling their moral grandeur*. In the book *De Medico* it is asserted that the truly philosophic physician is GODLIKE, using the identical term applied by Homer to Machaon, and adding 'that, indeed, he differs little from the gods.'''* No. XXXVII, 1845, p. 122.

So much for the sermon which emanated from a man who "loved not wisely, but too well." If the teachings of Homœopathy have a religious tendency we would advise the author of the *Delusions*, in his old age, to embrace the theological portion of the system.

Our author grows eloquent on page 14, in reference to his discovery, and enlarges to some extent on a small subject. He learns from Dr. Mure that "lice tea" is good for the itch.

Dr. Mure certainly causes the blush of shame to rise on the fall of Homœopathy with his unclean accompaniment, yet if we but glance at Allopathy we will find that it has established a precedent for such abominable things, and it has made no scruples as to the cleanliness of its remedial agents.

"Privately she tried to ascertain what *musk* and *castor* were, and in what doses Dr. Simpson and his friends gave them to their dainty feminine patients. She remembered Virgil's allusion to the one—"Virosaque Pontus Castorea"—and did not think it by any means a proper substance for physic; and she bethought herself also of the celebrated Hoffmann's edition of the other, as a second-hand something (bad enough when fresh and original) that was not to be thought of in civilized society, and never to be expressed but in a dead language,—'Attentione dignum curiosumque est,' says he, 'quod moschus odore suo privatus, in latrina si suspendatur, suavem suum odorem iterum acquirit;'[†] and

* Henderson, page 195.

† In Hoffmann's notes to *Pharm. Spagyricæ*, p. 166, by P. Poterus, whose *Materia Medica* he adopts by his notes and commendations.

being thus refreshed is a particularly fine medicine. Beside a scruple or a drachm of either, the billionth of a grain of the Patagonian pediculus rises into a *bonnebouche* for the most fastidious taste.

"Castor and musk perfume and adorn the *armamentarium* of modern Allopathy, and, therefore, might amply excuse her homœopathic rival for adopting the pediculus, even though it had no personal recommendations. But Allopathy is so incessantly pluming herself upon her antiquity and her noble antecedents, that her opponent was very willing to inquire if the family history, so full of all imaginable glories, would not be a still better authority for her closing with Dr. Mure and his offspring. Hoffmann seemed a communicative personage, and though all but a contemporary of Hahnemann, and therefore not likely to be so exquisite in physical matters as some of the more immediate descendants of Apollo, his modern renown gave a certain weight to his authority that made him appear at once a suitable person to apply to.

"The first specimen I shall give of Hoffmann and Allopathy (that wonderful system which, like a Chinese stripling, always presents itself so venerable with traditionary associations, that the 'vast age of the race and name overpowers the sense of youth in the individual') is the remarkable cure of an itchy Dominican friar. A contumacious *psora* had tormented the reverend father for six years, in spite of many physicians, till at last Poterus set him to eat vipers with a little salt; and the doctor tells us that, during the summer, above 150 of them having descended into the friar, 'his skin being renovated, he became quite another man, and he who before looked a particularly old person, was made young again, stronger than before, and fitter for everything'*. At p. 151 of the same ingenious volume, he gives directions for preparing the aqua or water of crabs, earth-worms, frogs, and frog-spawn; which, I may mention—in order to let people into the secret of that invaluable experience of so many

* Supplementum, p. 126.

centuries, which our allopathic friends always thrust into our upstart faces—were respectively found by the ‘capacious mind’ which meddled with ‘things, the real meaning of which is understood,’ to be admirable* in inflammations, (like the lancet and tartar emetic,) bites of mad-dogs, stone in the kidneys, consumption, worms of children, (the earth-worms did *their* business—a kind of Isopathy, therefore, like bugs for bug-bites,) hemorrhages, erysipelas, gout and burns, not to mention others that are not mentionable.

“At p. 152, we are introduced to something still more philosophical, and more conclusive of the soundness of the ancient foundations. But here I start at a great disadvantage, and feel almost as if I must shut the book, and leave Dr. Simpson to crow by himself. For while he, with little violence to decency, can give in plain English the worst therapeutic ravings of the most harebrained homœopathist (so-called,) I dare not do the same with the allopathic bill of fare, without sending my imaginative readers to their scent-boxes and snuff-mills. What can I make in English of the *Aqua stercoris animalium*, or *De oleo excrementorum*, or *Facultas stercoris humani*? I can’t venture to translate. Suffice it to say of these things ‘the meaning of which,’ as Leibnitz says, ‘is understood,’ that they are so offensive as to be better left in their classical dress. But I may translate some notices of their indubitable virtues, in order to do homage to the foundations and antecedents of that modern experience which has grown so naturally out of the good old stock, and preserve so strikingly the family features.† I shall give the unmentionable their dues, each in succession under the signs of No. 1, No. 2, and No. 3.

“Under No. 1 it is mentioned generally, that so and so ‘possess wonderful and excellent virtues;’ the stercus gallin-

* “Radically cure,” and “wonderfully benefit,” are the judicious phrases expressive of their action.

† An allopathic physician of eminence, not a hundred miles from this, uses “cow-tea” (which is neither milk nor beef-tea) in *diabetes*. A rude attempt at homœopathic practice!

arum being capital in the colic, that of swallows having anti-epileptic energies, especially when flavored with anodyne flower; that of the peacock, with a little spirit of wine, (to keep it down,) always manifests (*semper existit*) 'specific virtues against diseases of the head, giddiness and epilepsy.'

'Under No. 2 it is said, 'in . . . many secrets are hidden, as is proved by a multiplied experience,' and special mention is made of its power over the jaundice, malignant as well as benign tumors, and pestilential buboes. These external diseases are overpowered by poultices *ex stercore humano vel vaccino*; for he, the considerate Hoffmann, naively admits, that the oil from the former is so abominable that *he could not easily get it given internally*.

"Under No. 3 there is an opening sentence which I must submit to the learned:—'In animalium excrementis, mirum dictu quam rara et perfecta remedia reperiantur; et ut ab homine omnium principe exordiar, in humano stercore mira vis latet, in viscerum obstructionibus aperiendis.' This is what may be termed the solid foundation of Allopathy. It has a fluid foundation, too, by virtue of which it claims rule by sea as well as land; but I cannot trust the account of it, in somewhat too transparent Latin, to my page. However, the meaning 'is understood.'

"After all this there is a positive insipidity in the *Extract of mummies, Precipitate of human blood, and of the human skull, of frogs, vipers, worms, gems, and pearls, and the oil of human fat*—all of which are duly celebrated in the same fundamental volume, between pages 159 and 173. It is needless to say that the cures they worked were wonderful, and the allopathic experience they imparted as sound as any from that day to this—Dr. Dietl, Dr. Forbes, Sir Benjamin Brodie, and 'philosophical physicians' in general, being witnesses to the fact."

On page 15, the Doctor says, "Upon the '*Organon*' principle that '*Likes are cured by Likes*,' the matter expectorated from the lungs of a dying consumptive patient has been

given for the cure of consumption in others." But, by whom, Doctor? Not by any Homœopathic physician, but by those noble "special messengers," the members of the self-assumed LEGITIMATE profession. The Doctor is aware that it is not at all on the principle of *similia similibus curantur*, yet he has in this instance, as in many others, allowed his enmity to overcome his good sense; and the gentlemen who asked the question "Is Homœopathy an established science?" must be well satisfied by such "authenticated" statements that it is a "German scheme." The Doctor then proceeds to give extracts from the provings of *Natrum Muriaticum* and *Calcarea Carbonicum*; but as no inference is drawn we cannot conceive for what purpose he quoted from Jahr. Calc. carb. has and does now enjoy considerable confidence from the "God-like" profession. Hooper says, "chalk is absorbent, and possesses anti-acid qualities, it is exhibited in form of electrolytic, mixture or bolus, in pyrosis, cardialgia, diarrhœa, acidities of the stomach, the *primæ viæ*, rachitis, lacteæ, &c., &c., and it is said by some to be an antidote against white arsenic." Munro prescribed it for scald head. Bell, for soft and suppurating warts. Boerhaave used chalk as an antiseptic, a dissolvent, an astringent, and as a disicative. Mongi-not says it was of great use to him in whooping-cough. Later authors praise it in rheumatic and arthritic affections, in worm and intermittent fevers. Bretonneau uses it in chronic diarrhœa. Thus we see Allopathy uses simple chalk in no less than sixteen diseases. So much for its inertness in its crude state. As to its action when given in small doses, we will speak of that hereafter.

Now for the Doctors scapegoat, *Natrum Muriaticum* or common table salt. Of course he endeavors to throw ridicule upon Homœopathy by selecting remedial agents which are in common use, and at the same time he is quite careful not to explain to "those gentlemen" what use Allopathy has made of the same drugs.

Hooper says, table salt "possesses antiseptic, diuretic, and resolvent qualities, and is frequently employed in form-

of clyster fomentations, lotion, pediluvium, and bath, in obstipation, against worms, gangrene, scrofulous tumors, herpetic eruptions, arthritis, &c."

Plinius, lib. 11, chap. 12, advises it for scrofulous engorgements of the liver, biliary concretions, phthisis (consumption) white swellings, etc. Dr. Wezener has even recommended it for schirrus of the stomach. Pittschaff related a few cases of it cured by table salt in 1822. On the 4th of May, 1835, Dr. Munaret read before the Academy of Sciences a memoir in which he extolled the febrifuges properties of salt, and, at the same sitting, Ysenback and Brailou affirmed having employed salt in Asiatic Cholera with so much success that, of fifty patients, they lost only one! *

"In 1842, Dr. Amedée Latour published a work in which he states 'that salt may become a specific remedy for tubercular phthisis!'" Hence, we must conclude, notwithstanding Dr. Bayard's ugly sneer, that table salt is a great remedial agent, sanctioned by the legitimate profession, and swallowed by undeluded patients, if not by "broken hearted-young ladies."

On page 19, the Doctor proceeds thus: "Homœopathy, like its empirical associates, claims credit for wonderful cures, effected in a marvellously short time; and Collyer's specific for love-sick girls and broken-hearted ladies sinks into insignificance, when it is compared with the homœopathic conversion of heart-complaining neices into wives and mothers,—and homœopathic miraculous recoveries from puerperal fever and insanity." We "ask every man of common sense," does the above quotation show a desire to fairly discuss the subject of Homœopathy, to answer the question of "some gentlemen" in an honest manner? Does it show good sense? Nay, but does it not show such an ungovernable spirit of malignity and hatred, that the writer has only confined notions of all isms, and but little understanding of what he proposes to treat. What connection, we ask, is

* Teste, p. 459.

there between "love-sick girls, broken-hearted ladies, wives, and mothers, etc.," and the pathogenesis of a remedial agent?

On page 20, the Doctor is busy instructing his readers on the subject of the curative effect of nature. He says, "It exerts its influence in the harmonious action of the animal functions constituting health; it arrests the encroachment of disease, and when it is unable to overpower them, it still directs the intelligent physician." We wish the Doctor had not been so busily engaged with the "broken-hearted young ladies;" he might have continued his instructions, and informed us in what manner it "directed" the intelligent physician, and what it directed him to do to overpower the encroachment of diseases. What is there in nature which directs the Allopathic man to give opium for restlessness proceeding from febrile action, until permanent paralysis is produced by the drug, and the poor patient left a helpless cripple the remainder of his days, as was not long ago, done in this city? What is there in nature to indicate the exhibition of calomel until the jawbone is destroyed? We, a few days ago, saw a case in which one of those "God-like," "intelligent physicians" was "directed" to produce *that* direful effect. What is there in nature to direct the prescribing of purgatives for chronic constipations until Hæmorrhoids are produced and the *un-deluded* patient left a wreck from the consequences? What is there in the "progressive improvements and brilliant discoveries" which directs the application of a blister to the chest of an infant, allowing the little sufferer to writhe under torture of the unhealed surface for ten days and then give up the ghost from the effects of the irritative fever it produced? What is there in nature to direct tapping to remove the tumor produced by pregnancy? That is "one of the measures adopted to remove hindrances." One of the "special messengers" was directed to perform that wonderful feat. What peculiar forefinger of nature pointed out the application of red-hot iron to the shoulder in order to remove the pain produced by a dislocated clavicle?

What is there natural in giving a patient with an osseous affection, tonics in the morning, purgatives in the afternoon, and opiates at night, until he lies helpless and prostrate? We will explain; but, remember, it has taken Allopathy two thousand years to arrive at this knowledge.

He took the tonics because he was weak; he took the purgatives because his bowels were confined; and the opiates because he could not sleep from the pain in the diseased part. That is one view of the case. The opiates cause constipation, and he must have purgatives; the purgatives reduce him so rapidly that he must be kept up by tonics—that is the back action of the “direction.” The action of the tonic, purgative, and opiate all equally allow the disease to progress, while they pull down the general system, and remove the chances of a rapid recovery, thereby nursing the case, and gives the attendant “messenger” an opportunity to make a—bill! That is the common-sense view of the case.

“Christ HEALED fevers, HEALED leprosies, HEALED palsies, to demonstrate the omnipotence of His command,—and restoring sight to the blind man, he spat on the ground and made clay of the spittle, and He annointed the eyes of the blind man with clay and said ‘Go wash in the pool of Siloam,’ to demonstrate equally His omnipotence and that MEANS must be used by human agents.”

This medical calumniator of the Deity and the Holy Writings should have remembered that he had just been objecting to the sermon delivered by Everest, and now he ventures upon an exhortation himself in a manner profane, ridiculous and shameful. Dr. Watson, p. 212, says, “You should bleed and purge your patient, and afterwards give him from twenty minims to half a drachm of the wine of colchium, two or three times a day. When the symptoms are less active, you must be the less active, too; strive to set the disordered digestive organs right, (disordered by the purgatives advised.) Give small doses of mercury . . . Excite counter irritation

by blisters, or by tartar emetic ointment. After the use of bleeding or leeches, and the regulation of the bowels, preparations of iron, the sulphate of quina—tonics, in short, have been found, in not a few cases, beneficial." This is what "nature indicates" for the treatment of an inflamed eye. It was for the establishment of those "means," according to Dr. Bayard, that our Redeemer, eighteen hundred years ago, made the blind man see! The "legitimate profession" have added much to Divine physic, and, no doubt, they think theirs an improvement. Dr. Bayard attempts a very refane joke when he places Christ and Allopathic doctors in the same class. We would advise all "broken-hearted ladies," and "love-sick girls" to go to this semi-divine Allopathic "messenger," and be made whole. In fact, we would not be surprised to see the Doctor, after reading his 20th and 21st pages, in the pulpit, dispensing theology as he now does castor oil and blister plasters. We have known other "legitimate" men to unite the two professions. But, enough of this. The Rev. Thomas Everest, an over zealous clergyman, made himself ridiculous by mingling Divinity and Physic, and R. Bayard, M.D., D.C.L, with an example before him of human weakness, has gone a step beyond, and blasphemed. They "both confirm the remark that, by forced explanations of one text or other of the Bible, they attempt to defend and justify their own peculiar type of foolishness."

On page 22, we find the case of Mr. D.'s child, which died from the suppression of an eruption by the use of itch ointment. Perhaps the infant was saved a vast amount of suffering, by dying before the Doctor arrived with his heroic "legitimate" treatment. From what source did the deluded mother obtain the "superior" knowledge which prompted her to apply the ointment? On page viii, in the preface, we find, on the subject of itch, as follows: "I shall not mention the frequent three-day cures effected by a sixpence, or at most, by a shilling's worth of sulphur and hogs-lard." That

answers the above question. Allopathy taught it. Hence, as Dr. Bayard asserts that the child died in consequence of the use of the sulphur ointment, Allopathy is guilty of at least one murder.

At page 23, Dr. Bayard arrives at his mathematical bravado, and, no doubt, when he quoted from Simpson and presented to his admirers in St. John the tremendous array of figures and cyphers, he expected to behold Homœopathy come tumbling down with all its "spiritualities and globule-ism" and Allopathy, as before, would have the field to itself. But, alas! the system stands, the able pen of a noted disputant could not produce a tremble, and, no doubt, it will continue to stand, and Dr. Bayard will be gathered to his fathers without having the satisfaction of beholding the death of this charlatan delusion. After attentively investigating the "Delusions" remarks upon the Homœopathic dose, we have concluded that the Doctor has an utter disbelief in their utility.

Now, how much does the author know of the efficacy of the infinitesimal dose? Has he ever prescribed it in a case of disease, and watched its effects? Or, in fact, has he the amount of knowledge requisite to make a Homœopathic prescription? We take the liberty to answer nay, to both queries. Therefore, he is totally ignorant of what he is writing about. Had he tested the small dose and found it inert, he would have made it known; and as he made no such statements, the conclusion is, that he never gave it a trial, but allows Simpson, Routh, etc., etc., to do the thinking, while he, in a manner quite unphilosophical, retails the falsity as facts. We have for seven years given the infinitesimal dose, and it has always answered our expectations. Now, we appeal to any candid man, and ask him whose statement is to be credited, Dr. Bayard's or ours? He never prescribed the homœopathic dose, and we have always prescribed it. Which of us, according to the usual nature of things, is most capable of answering the question—"Is the small dose efficacious?"

Every person who has investigated any science from a pure motive, has been aware that there are many things which it is impossible for finite minds to comprehend. Many things occur in our ordinary affairs that the deepest philosopher cannot explain. Providence has, in His wisdom, drawn a line, beyond which human intellect is not permitted to penetrate. It is an admitted fact that the moon is kept in its orbit round the earth, and the earth in its orbit round the sun, by the same force which causes a stone to fall to the ground. These bodies are separated by immense distances, how can they act on each other? How is it possible for an inert lump of matter to influence another inert lump a hundred millions of miles off? It is by the force of gravitation; but what is gravity? and how does it act? Can Dr. Bayard explain?

A lucifer match is rubbed on a rough surface and it inflames. *How* friction produces such a result we know not. If it be said that friction evolves heat, and that heat inflames the match, the question returns: *how* does friction evolve heat? and *how* does heat inflame the match? Can Dr. Bayard tell?

If we threw a piece of metal potassium upon ice, it instantly inflames, burns itself into the ice and disappears. Part of the ice has been melted, the water decomposed, its hydrogen burnt, and its oxygen has united with the metal and formed a portion of caustic potash, which is all that remains in the cavity of the ice. These extraordinary phenomena are the effect of chemical affinity, but what is that? and how does it act? Can Dr. Bayard inform us?

If we collect in a strong vessel two volumes of hydrogen and one of oxygen, it is well known that the contact of flame, or an electric spark will cause an explosion, the gases disappear and a drop of water is produced. Will Dr. Bayard be so kind as to explain that chemical phenomena?

We can surround a seed with suitable proportions of air, warmth and moisture, and can observe the gradual develop-

ment of the germ of the entire plant and of the ripening seed. *How* have all these wonderful changes been effected? They are attributed to the vital force, but we know not in the least what that is, nor how it acts. Dr. Bayard will please inform us!

We take food and are nourished, we take poison and die; but how is all this? Another answer is expected.

Although it is impossible for the Doctor to explain any of the foregoing phenomena, he will not deny their truth, yet he will deny the efficacy of the infinitesimal dose, because they are like the other operations of nature, beyond his comprehension.

We are not entitled to reject anything which professes to be a *fact*, if supported by a sufficient amount of evidence, merely because it is inconsistent with our expectation, does not coincide with our previous opinions, or is not within the limits of our former experience. We are not justified in concluding against a statement of fact by *a priori* reasoning, or theoretical consideration. Analogies may render an assertion probable, or the contrary, but *no* reasoning is conclusive against a matter of fact. The truth or falsehood of the announcement of a fact cannot be settled by reasoning or argumentation. It must be decided by evidence.

We quote the following from Professor Henderson's "Homœopathy Fairly Represented," page 265:

"M. Boudin, as we have seen, cured agues, which had resisted quinine, with a *single dose* of the hundredth of a grain of arsenic*; now the hundredth of a grain is to the weight of a man of fifteen stone, as one is to one hundred and fifty millions. What an infinitesimal quantity of medicine to affect so powerfully so vast and disproportionate a quantity of matter! But Allopathy affords a still more remarkable fact,—a fact, indeed, which deprives her of all right to quarrel with any system on the score of its minute

*If he used the arsenite of potass, his dose of white arsenic must have been the two hundredth of a grain.

doses. Mr. Hunt, an allopathic physician, apparently of long standing and much experience, published in 1847 an interesting little volume on the treatment of certain intractable chronic skin diseases. At p. 14 of that work he says,—‘*A fourth part of a minim of Fowler’s solution*, taken thrice-a-day, has, in a few weeks, effected the permanent cure of psoriasis guttata, in a female of delicate habit, intolerant alike in a high degree of all mineral substances.’ Fowler’s solution is a solution of arsenite of potass, in which the arsenic acid and the potass are present in about equal quantities. The great Allopathic Review—the British and Foreign—in 1847, accepts Mr. Hunt’s case as genuine and true, and remarks that each of his doses contained only *the four hundred and eightieth part of a grain* of the white arsenic, or arsenious acid. Now, as susceptibility to arsenic, or to any other medicine, does not depend on, and has no connexion with the weight of the individual, there is no reason whatever why our already selected fifteen-stone patient should not be sensitive to the same dose. The 480th part of a grain is to fifteen stone as one is to seven hundred and five millions six hundred thousand; or as a mile to a line that might pass above seven times between the earth and sun; or that might pass twenty-eight thousand two hundred times round the earth! In short, nearly as one pound is to the whole national debt,—or as one man to all the inhabitants of the world. Since doses of medicine do not require to be increased in proportion to the weight of the person who takes them, and if in the proportion of one to about seven hundred millions they are unquestionably effectual as remedies, why may they not when in proportion of one to seven thousand millions, or seven hundred thousand millions? Mr. Hunt does not tell us that he found smaller doses of arsenic than the four hundred and eightieth of a grain ineffectual. He appears to have tried none more minute. But physicians, in every respect as much entitled to credit, have maintained that doses a very great deal smaller have proved effectual in their experience, and the experience of homœ-

opathic physicians is now so great in all quarters of the globe, that it can no longer be ignored, or explained away. Allopathic controversialists, and others who have a deep personal interest in resisting and endeavoring to quash Homœopathy, may remain as blind as they please by wilfully closing their eyes, but their blindness will not prevent other men from seeing. And no man of calm and ordinary judgment can fail to see, when the question between us and our opponents is not one of ounces or pounds of drugs against fractions of grains, but really and truly one of fractions of grains against fractions of grains, that the dispute lies within a very narrow compass, and that the opposing parties do not differ so very much as some either ignorant or designing persons have endeavored to make the public believe. Allopathy has committed herself to the infinitesimal doses in the instances I have mentioned. Doses of the hundredth and of the four hundred and eightieth of a grain are as inconceivable as remedies as doses of the millionth or decillionth of a grain. Nothing but experience could render the former doses credible as efficient doses; there is no process of reasoning, no *a priori* probability apart from experience to suggest the expectation that doses so minute could be effectual in curing diseases; and the same experience which is adequate to prove their efficiency is adequate to prove the efficiency of the still more minute doses; in point of fact, there is an experience and a testimony immensely greater on the side of Homœopathy in favour of its usual doses, than there is on the side of Allopathy in favour of the doses I have adduced from its authenticated records. How absurd is the notion that there can be no testimony or experience on the subject of the usual homœopathic doses, but such as are presented by *allopathic* authorities. A pretty mode of settling the dispute indeed! If this original method be introduced into universal practice, and the adherents of any prevalent doctrine are to utter the final judgment that must settle the character of every question that arises in opposition to the common beliefs,—Protestantism is easily proved to be false in Roman Catholic

countries; Christianity itself is at once proved to be a delusion among the Chinese, as well as the religion of that ancient people to be a miserable idolatry among the enlightened citizens of Great Britain."

Strange to say, the unbelievers in the small dose are to be found only in the allopathic ranks—among men who never tested their effects, and the *un*-“deluded” allopathic patrons. While its advocates are those who have for years administered small doses, and those who have in the hour of trial and suffering, tested their curative action; therefore, we can now afford to dismiss the subject without further explanation.

On page 24, the Doctor places “*mammon and credulity*” as the basis of the homœopathic system. We utterly deny his right to come to such conclusions from any of the wonderful arguments he has as yet adduced; but, thank heaven, those slanderous expressions avail but little as evidence against an established science. Men of enquiring minds ask something more tangible than Dr. Bayard’s impressions, which were obtained from his master, Professor Simpson. The Doctor was not wise when he smuggled mammon into the Evidences. If he will ask himself how many patrons he has lost during his day by excessive charges, he will be astonished at the number when he receives the answer. Hence as Homœopathy is Charlatanism because it has an eye to the fee, Dr. Bayard is a Charlatan. But it would be rudeness to pronounce such a disgraceful verdict upon him; he was only over anxious to manufacture evidences, and he overstepped the mark.

At page 25 we find another sample of premeditated misrepresentation of the Homœopathic *Materia Medica*. As regards Belladonna, Dr. Bayard quotes thus: “That he is an ox, that he gives the word of command, that his head is transparent, that his nose is transparent, that he is pretending to count money.” We will look into this “absurdity” and try to make Dr. Bayard’s unfairness as “transparent” as the above mentioned nose.

Belladonna (Deadly Nightshade) is classed by old school authority as a narcotico-acrid. Dr. Guy, in his work on Forensic Medicine, p. 695, remarks "that delirium is the most characteristic symptom of the above mentioned drug; . . . the delirium is commonly of the violent kind, and is often attended with incoherence." That being the fact, is it extraordinary that a person laboring under the effects of a large dose of Belladonna should fancy himself an ox, or any other animal? By visiting the Provincial Insane Asylum many stranger mental delusions will be seen in persons who have not taken drugs to produce them. Yet Dr. Waddell prescribes remedies to those patients; but, according to Dr. Bayard, it is an "absurd delusion" to suppose that medicine can act upon a mind diseased. Verily, the Doctor, when he wrote those quotations, must have been laboring under an immense dose of conium, until a sensation became a fact, if he supposed that transcribing the symptoms of *mania* found in different Homœopathic writings were "evidences" that globuleism was a delusion. His dishonesty, like the patient's nose, is *very* transparent.

In like manner could we proceed with the sixteen other remedies, but our space will not permit. Dr. Bayard should at least possess a general knowledge of the subject he traduces.

From page 25 to 33 we find such an infinitesimal amount of good sense, such an entire absence of any argument, that we pass it by, and let it go for all the weight of "evidence" it will make.

The next evidence offered is the Bull of Dr. Paris, President of the Royal College of Physicians, as follows:—

"Sir,—The Foundation of the Royal College of Physicians was for the purpose of guaranteeing to the public skilful and safe practitioners. The College of Physicians regards the so-called homœopathists as neither skilful nor safe practitioners. Therefore, the College cannot, without betraying a sacred trust, give its License to persons whom they regard as wholly unworthy their confidence, and with whom it is not possible they can hold any communion.

"I remain, &c.,

JOHN AYRTON PARIS."

ask any candid man if that is "evidence" against Homœopathy? Does it in the least demonstrate that the system is a delusion. It was but a short time ago that a British Physician was thought unworthy to have a place in the French Academy of Medicine, yet it does not prove that English Physicians are less clever than the French. The Bible has been excluded from different countries, but who, in a civilized land, would argue from that fact that the Bible is an injurious publication with improper tendencies? Political liberty is banished from Austria and France, and what Briton loves his own opinions and freedom of speech the less on that account. Dr. Bayard must bring more substantial evidence than the harmless epistle of Dr. Paris, before he can upset Homœopathy. This same institution persecuted Jenner for his discovery of vaccination and refused him their license; and they committed Grænevelt to Newgate for prescribing cantharis internally. Hence that testimony is no dishonor. The Royal College of Surgeons when requested to join in putting down Homœopathy gave the following decisive answer, on several occasions:

"The Council of the Royal College of Surgeons of England have attentively and repeatedly considered the various communications which they have received on the subject of Homœopathy; and after mature deliberation have resolved THAT IT IS NOT EXPEDIENT FOR THE COLLEGE TO INTERFERE IN THE MATTER."

A few years ago the university of Edinburgh refused to grant its degrees to any student if he was known to hold views favorable to Homœopathy; they have intimated since, through the Lord Provost, that, in future, Homœopathy would not prove an impediment to any student taking his degrees. (See Sharp's Controversy, p. 9.) In the United States the system was put down by the high hand of the law, and persons practicing the system were persecuted by Allopathic men without mercy. Now every State in the Union recognises it as a *legitimate system*, and supposes that an inteller-

tual community can best judge which system is worthy of confidence. Therefore, we cannot but conclude that the thundering Bull of the Royal College of Physicians is *no evidence.*

Now, as to the dismissal of Dr. Reed from the service, by Lieutenant General Vivian, for the one-sided statement of which see Dr. Bayard's work, page 34. He was a believer in Homœopathy, and practised as his conscience dictated; and, because Staff Surgeon Kalazdy, General Smith, and Lieut. Gen. Vivian did not believe in the system, he must be "broke." Why, in the name of common sense, does not Dr. Bayard bring better arguments than garbled nonsense and the opinions of the Editor of the London *Lancet*, who, by the way, has good reasons for hating Homœopathy. The *Lancet's* opinions are worth as much as Dr. Bayard's, and neither will be admitted by reflecting individuals as evidences, except as evidence that the author of the "Delusions" is hard pushed for material, and is willing to admit all questionable statements into his pamphlet to quash "a waning delusion."

"Homœopathy does not appear to stand well with the present Emperor of Russia, as he has prohibited quacks and quacking throughout all the Russias," quotes Dr. Bayard. A sample of original reasoning that! Because the Emperor has prohibited quacking, Homœopathy is prohibited! That does not follow, Doctor, unless you prove Homœopathy a system of quackery. At least the Russian court physician is not expelled, and he is a Homœopath. The Doctor's logic will not, this time, make evidence.

In several places Dr. Bayard has alluded to a nostrum sold by Hahnemann, under the name of *Pnoeum*, which consisted of nothing but Borax, and concludes that, as he deceived the world by the sale of it, at a high price, he has deceived the world with Homœopathy. Not a safe conclusion, but the Doctor borrowed it, and is not, therefore, accountable for its tendencies. Why cannot Allopathic

scribblers write with common honesty? Why relate a portion of a sorry tale, and omit its redeeming part? Dr. Bayard, when he quoted the slander, must have known the whole story, why keep it from his readers? "A witness in a court of law is required to tell the truth, the *whole truth*, and nothing but the truth," exclaims Dr. Bayard, He is, it seems, better at giving than taking advice.

Hahnemann, like many other great chemists, made a sad blunder, and mistook Borax for a new alkali, which he sold at a high price, but he IMMEDIATELY DISCOVERED HIS ERROR, AND AT ONCE REFUNDED THE MONEY. Again, it must be remembered that, at the time of selling the nostrum, he was an Allopathic physician, and, therefore, excusable for committing a little quackery. However, it amounted to nothing more than a chemical blunder, yet our opponents will resort to such miserable arguments in their endeavors to traduce Homœopathy. How many "legitimate" and "scientific" physicians of the present day are proprietors and puffers of nostrums? Sir James Clark and Dr. Ayer are familiar examples. That wonderful and mighty evidence is ruined.

We now come to the great bug-bear *Psora*. One would suppose, from reading the "Evidences," that it was something first promulgated by Hahnemann, and exclusively adopted by his disciples, but we will proceed to prove that the idea is admitted by *every* sensible physician of the present day, Dr. Bayard excepted, and at the same time it will be a striking example of Allopathic unfairness. Even if we grant the Doctor's argument that it is a homœopathic idea, it amounts to nothing more than a clever pathological hypothesis, which does not materially affect the homœopathic system. As this is neither the time nor place to discuss the psoric doctrine, let us assume it correct, inasmuch as both Homœopathic and Allopathic writers adopt the theory as true. "In 1828, Hahnemann published one of his most celebrated works, 'Chronic Diseases, their peculiar nature, and homœopathic treatment.' In this publication he gave

forth his opinions on the ancient doctrine of psora as a constitutional taint, to which a vast variety of the most important, chiefly chronic, diseases owed their existence. So far was he from claiming credit of being the originator of this pathological doctrine, that he adduces, in support of his decision in its favor, nearly a hundred allopathic authorities, his predecessors, as having more or less explicitly declared their conviction of its truth, or given examples in illustration of it. It is ignorantly sneered at by Dr. Simpson, and the many who take up the cuckoo-cry of derision against every thing that Hahnemann taught, as the *Itch doctrine* of the Homœopaths, whereas it is neither an itch doctrine, in a candid and intelligent sense, nor is it a peculiarly homœopathic doctrine. 'I call it Psora,' says Hahnemann, 'with the view of giving it a general designation,' and that he did not regard it as synonymous with, or limited in its meaning to *the itch*, every one knows who has perused his treatises upon the subject. One sentence of his is sufficient to settle this point, and to leave those who have so industriously misrepresented his opinions, utterly without excuse: 'I am persuaded that not only are the majority of the innumerable skin diseases which have been described and distinguished by Willan, but also almost all the pseudo-organizations, etc., etc., with few exceptions, merely the products of the *multiform psora*.' " *

Frederick Hoffmann, who is recognized as a standard author on pathology, says as follows: "We have known atrocious pains of the joints suddenly removed on the occurrence of itch having the character of white lepra. For, whilst shifting of the morbid matter from internal to external parts, is very beneficial, on the contrary, what turns from the external to internal parts is most pernicious. . . . The true, proximate, and immediate cause of these evils, because almost all the most serious and deadly diseases, both chronic and acute, and these the most firmly rooted in the system of

* Henderson, p. 115.

nervous parts, may be relieved by the matter being expelled, according to the habit of body; and, on the contrary, the matter being repelled to the interior parts, the same disease may be excited. . . . Experience itself teaches this truth, for innumerable observations of the most credible authors exist, which record that spasmodic asthma, inflammation of the joints, gout, and many other diseases, have been removed on the appearance of itch, and, on the other hand, have arisen on the itch being suppressed."

Dr. K. Wenzel, in 1825, published a book entitled "The true itch with special regard to its improper treatment as a source of innumerable and frightful secondary diseases." This was three years before Hahnemann wrote his chronic diseases. Anteuirieth, an allopathic writer of great distinction, has views analogous to Hahnemann in regard to Psora. He says that, "a great many diseases are dependant upon itch," and he cites many examples from the Tübingen Hospital to prove the truth of his assertion. He ascribes the occurrence of these serious chronic diseases to the repulsion of itch by ointments and salves. He says, "*it is sad and disgusting to entertain the notion, as so many do, that itch cannot be driven too rapidly off the skin.*" He does not agree with Dr. Bayard's "three day cures with a shillings worth of grease and sulphur." The celebrated Professor Schölein of Berlin, published a work on General and Special Pathology and Therapeutics, and on page 87 he gives a description of a disease which he terms asthma psoricum, "It is," says he, "always preceded by itch that has been rudely suppressed by ointments." Another contradiction of Dr. Bayard's itch cure. Dr. Wertenweber, in a series of papers published in the Austrian Medical Journal, enumerates twenty-seven diseases as the result of repelled itch, from his own and others' observation. "I may remark that primary itch is *positively a local affection and may be immediately cured by external applications, without incurring any danger*" says Dr. Bayard in his preface.

Professor Schölein says this : "*It was remarkably impudent in Hahnemann to pretend that he was the first to point out the consequence of the itch.*"

"Schölein CLAIMS IT FOR ALLOPATHY, and, with the ignorance which is universal among allopathic writers who would depreciate Hahnemann, accuses the discoverer of Homœopathy of arrogating to himself the discovery also of the *itch* doctrine though he expressly refers to nearly a hundred preceding authors in confirmation of his own views regarding it."*

As regards the existence of the *acarus* in itch, no one disputes, but it will trouble the author of the "*Delusions*" to demonstrate whether it is the cause or consequence of the disease.

Hence we see that *Psora*, if it is a dishonor to Homœopathy, which has only adopted it from its parent Allopathy, must be a sad disgrace to those who would very unwisely disown their offspring. And, as regards the *truth* of the theory, we have read too many learned authors, both Allopathic and Homœopathic, upon the subject, to credit Dr. Bayard's disbelief. Homœopathy makes no particular claim to originality in its teachings, or speculations. It is a system which has arisen from the old school — arisen from the accumulated knowledge of thousands of years, a consequence of that knowledge, and it has selected all the gems from the rubbish, cleansed them of surrounding impurities, fitting each in its proper place, until there has been a system of medicine given to the world, which claims for itself superiority over the self-assumed "legitimate" practice.

* Henderson, p. 170.

TABLE-TURNING.

Dr. Bayard has much to say about "Spirit Rapping" and "Table Turning," he classes them with Homœopathy. Now, we will try our hand at this wonderful art, and practice upon his ingeniously carved statistical tables, and perhaps we may get them to "turn" over to our side of the house, and be the means of saving Homœopathy in St. John from deep disgrace.

One fact is very striking in regard to Dr. Bayard's garbled statistics, which is, that inflammation of the bowels, peritonites, pleurisy, and kindred diseases are all passed by without being honored with a word. The reason of this is quite apparent, the contrast would not appear well in a pamphlet against Homœopathy. He, however, enlarges on the subject of Pneumonia, (inflammation of the lungs,) and takes these grounds to substantiate his assertions:—

1st. The official returns from the homœopathic men are to be disbelieved.

2nd. The cases of Pneumonia are *selected* for the purpose of presenting a clean report.

3rd. The success is in a measure attributed to the gentleness of the Sisters of Charity.

4th. That Fleischman is not competent to diagnose inflammation of the lungs, and the Doctor is fearful that he may have confounded it with common cold or, heaven save the mark, flatulency!

5th. The official homœopathic returns are not so favourable by many per cent. as the allopathic.

Now most of the bright ideas which appear on Dr. Bayard's pages emanated either from Dr. Routh or Professor Simpson, and have been refuted and proved to be false several times, yet Allopathy clings to them as its only hope. Pro-

fessor Henderson has, to a great length, alluded to all the above points and proved, beyond the shadow of a doubt, the superiority of the homœopathic system. We will quote from him again, to some extent, as it will be only Henderson *vs.* Simpson.

In discussing the merits of the two systems in Pneumonia, he says : " I have indeed been at pains to discover accounts of allopathic cures that were universally favorable for the happy issue of the treatment, and I have been successful in my search, having found them in treatises by Louis and Bouillaud. These, with the examples from the practice of Dietl of Vienna, are all I have taken from allopathic authorities. The Homœopathic side gives me no latitude for selection, for I know of no groups of cases published by homœopathic authorities, with the exception of the 41 by Tessier in his *Recherches Cliniques*, 1850, and the 11 by myself in the *British Journal of Homœopathy* for 1850, which proves the condition which I regard as indispensable, on our side at least, of being a complete series of cases, from which *none* have been excluded or withheld from publication, that had occurred to the narrator between the commencement of his observations for the time, and the preparation of his treatises for the press." *

First point of Dr. Bayard, " the returns of the homœopathic men are not to be credited." It so occurs that Drs. Henderson and Tessier occupy a position in the profession which places *their* statements of fact beyond question ; one a Professor of Edinburgh, the other a French physician, connected with a hospital in Paris, men who would not publish falsities, and in whose statements we may place all confidence.

Second, " Homœopathic cases are selected." We will prove that *unselected* homœopathic cases are not so fatal as selected allopathic cases of Pneumonia.

Age :—Of the 50 cases above the age of puberty, 25, or

* Henderson, p. 69.

just one half were above 40 years of age, and of these 16 were above 50 years old, and the average of all the cases was 41 years.

Complication and Constitution:—There were exclusive of jaundice and pleurisy, 14 with complications or about 1 in $3\frac{1}{2}$. The complications consisted of diseases of the heart, chronic, bronchitis, delirium tremens, pericarditis, acute bronchitis, and meningitis; besides those 14 in which local complications are specified, there were 8 others in which local complications is noted as enfeebled and deteriorated health, so that we have 20 cases of complications, or 1 in $2\frac{1}{2}$, a larger proportion than the worst of the allopathic groups present.

Mortality:—Of the 50 cases, 3 terminated fatally, the proportion of deaths to recoveries being one to 17, or just 6 per cent. Of the 26 cases that were aged 43 years, and under, only one died, and at the age of 43; none died of the 25 that were under 40. The others were aged respectively 58 and 60; here, then, are three deaths in 35 cases, aged between 40 and 70 years, a period of life, when, according to Grisolle's extensive data, the mortality is at the rate of 23 per cent. in allopathic practice.

We have now two groups of cases (allopathic) furnished by Louis. The first group consisting of 78 cases, which were SELECTED, as Louis states that 46 other cases occurred along with the 78, but he had excluded them *because the pneumonia in them occurred in unfavorable circumstances*, such as previous bad health, while, of the 78 cases, he says: "all were in a state of perfect health at the moment when the first symptoms began." We might justly decline admitting such cases to a comparison with the unselected homœopathic group—in which many, about a third, were in bad health at the commencement of the pneumonia. This advantage will tell, however, all the more to the credit of Homœopathy, when it is known that of Louis's 78 cases, 28, or nearly one third, died! What makes the difference, in

the success of the two systems still more remarkable is, that Louis's cases were, in a large proportion, of an early age, and even the average age of the 28 fatal cases was only 49. That of the 50 that recovered was about 35.

Louis, writing at another period, states that, in the course of four preceding years, 150 cases of pneumonia had passed under his notice, but he limits himself again to a selection of cases, 29 in all, who were, like the former group, "in excellent health at the moment when the first symptoms of pneumonia occurred." In the smaller selection he was more fortunate, four only of the twenty-nine having died, or one in seven, about fourteen per cent.; but, still, nearly two and a-half times greater than the mortality of the unselected homœopathic cases.

Bouillaud has published an account of 75 cases of pneumonia. The following are the particulars of his cases:

Age:—Three-fifths were below 37 years of age, while, of the homœopathic cases, 25 were below 37, just one-half. He had but five cases above 57 years old, while, of cures, there were 14 above 57. This fact is important, inasmuch as Grisolle, in his statistics of pneumonia, states that the loss between 50 and 60, is not less than 27 per cent.

Complications:—Bouillaud had one case of chronic complication—chronic bronchitis; the other complications, amounting to ten, were acute diseases of various kinds.

Mortality:—Ten deaths occurred among the 75 cases, or one in seven and a half, being at the rate of fourteen and two-thirds per cent.

Therefore, we have, from the preceding groups, the following conclusion:

Homœopathic group, loss -	-	-	6 in 100
Louis, group No. 1, "	-	-	34 in 100
Louis, group No. 2, "	-	-	14 in 100
Bouillaud's cases, "	-	-	14½ in 100

Now there is no backing out of these statements, and any person who will take the trouble to contrast the history of

these cases and the statements in the "Delusions" must be satisfied that these are better substantiated, and more worthy of confidence. Dr. B. cites official returns from the Army and Navy. We cannot by any means accept these as true. Who is to vouch that the gentlemen of the sword and lancet are sufficiently bound to distinguish between pneumonia and *flatulence*. According to allopathic writings it is difficult, and it is well known that the medical gentlemen of the service are good surgeons, but indifferent physicians, when we consider them *en masse*. Again, the per centage is too great to be believed, after reading the result of pneumonia treated by Louis and Bouillaud. Therefore, we are quite safe in concluding that Homœopathy has saved its reputation in inflammation of the lungs.

We will propose to Dr. Bayard, after he gets his hospital built, to allow us to treat a few cases of non-organic disease, and let him have ocular demonstration of the power or inertness of Homœopathy. In that proceeding the Doctor would be made a convert to the faith, or would issue another edition of the "Delusions," more stocked with wonderful failures than the first.

The Editor of the *British and Foreign Medical Review*, speaking of Fleischman, remarks as follows—after giving him the character of being a "well-educated physician," of "honor and respectability"—"we cannot, therefore, refuse to admit the accuracy of his statements as to matters of fact." Therefore, we have the *highest allopathic* proof that Fleischman's statistics are true and correct. As regards the fever reports of Fleischman, Dr. Forbes affirms, "The amount of deaths in the fever and eruptive diseases is certainly *below* the ordinary proportion." This fact he attempts to explain away on the ground that Homœopathy merely does *no* harm, while, very often, Allopathy does *much* harm. We deny the correctness of his conclusion as far as Homœopathy is concerned; but, no doubt, he is correct in regard to Allopathy—at least he ought to know. We are satisfied with the admission of superior success

Pleurisy is known to be a very violent disease, and one which demands prompt remedial means. The following are the comparative results of the homœopathic and allopathic treatment:

Allopathic Hospitals, - - 13 in 100 died.

Homœopathic " - - 3 in 100 died.

In dysentery the results are still more favorable for Homœopathy, being thus:—

Allopathic Hospitals, - - 22 in 100 died

Homœopathic Hospitals, - - 3 in 100 died.

Fever, excluding Typhus:

Allopathic Hospitals, - - - 9 in 100 died.

Homœopathic Hospitals, - - 2 in 100 died.

Thus statistics are given by Fleischman, and according to Dr. Forbes they are correct. They serve to illustrate the important fact that Homœopathy is more successful than Allopathy in the most violent diseases.

Now, to Dr. Bayard's comparison of incurable diseases in Homœopathic and Allopathic hospitals. We admit that, such is the case, as he states, and we take great pleasure in being able to agree with him upon one point.

"The far greater proportion of incurable organic diseases that find their way into the large, old, allopathic hospitals, as into medical poor-houses for the incurable, places them at a disadvantage as to the class of cases subjected to treatment. When their mortality is brought into comparison with that of Homœopathic hospitals. This much is due to fairness; but, at the same time I strongly suspect that, although our mortality would be greater than it is, if our hospitals had the same proportion of organic disease as the allopathic had, the difference between the results of the two methods would be quite as great, if not greater, if the allopathic hospitals had acute inflammation substituted in place of their excess of organic diseases; for it is only a *proportion* of the latter that die annually, though all of them must die within a few years."*

* Henderson, p. 106.

It is no use for Dr. Bayard to endeavor to argue Homœopathy into a greater mortality, the thing cannot be done—at least in a manner that it will stay there—Dr. Bayard and other allopathic gentlemen may as well admit the fact, that they know Homœopathy is better than the ancient system as much so as travelling in a rail car is better than the ancient method of riding a donkey, but they like the old way the best, and feel inclined to stick to it. Dr. Bayard, however, should, like his kinsman in New York, (Dr. E. Bayard) embrace the true system of medicine and be the means of doing much good in the world before he dies.

Dr. Bayard has, much to his own satisfaction, found an example of homœopathic failure in cholera. After attentively searching the world over, he finds, in Marseilles, that the homœopathic mortality was 21 out of 26 patients, while the allopathic was 11 out of 25 cases, making the loss stand thus:

Homœopathic	-	-	-	84	per cent.
Allopathic	-	-	-	44	" "
Difference of				40	" "

We will say nothing more about M. Charge as we are not informed as to the particulars of his loss, but we might conclude, from reasoning, that something was wrong, as Homœopathy no where else ever lost the large amount of 44 per cent. in cholera. We will take the allopathic loss 44 per cent. in cholera as a standard and contrast it with the Homœopathic loss in different parts of the world.

The following extract will be read with interest by Dr. Bayard, as it emanates from a clergyman. It is from a letter written by the Rev. W. Pryse, dated April 7, 1856, Sylhet, East Indies: "The cholera has again visited our town, and has been very fatal in the villages round about us, during the last month. We use the homœopathic system of medicine. I do not speak in its favor from prejudice, but from conviction of its superiority. . . . From ignorance upon these matters, I cannot speak of its success in

England, but of this I am happy to say *that it has not failed in any one instance where I have made use of the medicine in time.*" The following we clip from the *Church Witness* which will qualify the Allopath Marseilles' victory:—" *Le Moniteur* the official organ of the French Government announces that Dr. Mabbit, a Homœopathist, has been created Knight of the Legion of Honor, as a reward of distinguished success in his treatment of cholera." The following are the statistical results of his treatment contrasted with the allopathic in the same city.

Allopathic loss	-	-	-	40 per cent.
Homœopathic loss,	-	-	-	7½ per cent.

In favor of Homœopathy, - 32½ " "

If Dr. Bayard will but glance at the comparative results of cholera in the United States, where we learn from the "Delusions" that the system is going down, he will find that the results are much in favor of Globuleism. The general statistical results being, from the treatment in New York, New Orleans, Cincinnati, and Philadelphia:—

Allopathic loss,	-	-	-	30 per cent.
Homœopathic loss,	-	-	-	7 per cent.

Homœopathic superiority, 23 " "

" Here are facts and figures, 'if the legitimate men' venture to deny the statements" it will not at all improve their per centage.

Dr. Bayard has, like many we have soon before him, endeavored to make capital out of the reputed failure of Homœopathy, in the hands of Andral and Baillie, of Paris, two eminent allopathic men.

Suppose that Dr. Bayard had his hospital built, and he should determine to quash Homœopathy, by one grand system of experimentation with infinitesimal spiritualities, with a desire, premeditated, to convince the world that the twin brother of Mesmerism was arrant quackery, would he find

the task difficult? No! Or, again, could we expect at his hands a fair and impartial trial? By no means. He has pinned his life and reputation to the skirts of his old and ancient mother, Allopathy, and if she sinks, down goes all his glory and renown. Therefore, it is a principle of nature—one of the "directions" before alluded to—that he should sustain Allopathy, right or wrong, and—he would do it! Andral and Baillie were in the same position, and hence their verdict. It would be taxing these grey heads with too much humiliation to ask them to acknowledge that they have been doing wrong all their lives, and have just found it out. Oh, no! they will still declare they are correct, and fight it out, until they go to that land where physic is unknown.

Now, for the Doctor's second sample of arithmetic, and the preparations of the Homœopathic remedies. We should think that the Dr.'s pharmaceutical knowledge was not very deep, or he could have at least given us a true statement of the manner of preparing potencies. We admit that Hahnemann used one drop to a hundred, but no pharmacy of the present day uses other than the decimal scale, or ten to ninety.

Dr. Bayard states that in order to make the thirtieth attenuation, it would require "an ocean of fourteen septillion cubic miles of alcohol; or in a quantity sufficient to make one hundred and forty billion spherical masses, extending from limit to limit of Neptune's orbit; or in a quantity equal to many hundred spheres, each with a semi-diameter or radius, extending from the earth to the nearest fixed star."

Now, we will give our statement of the case. First, we will take ten drops of Aconite, for instance. In order to make the 1st potency we require a small vial and ninety drops of alcohol, mingle the two together and shake the bottle until the medicine and alcohol become intimately mixed. For the 2nd potency, ten drops of the 1st, and ninety other drops of alcohol in another clean vial, prepared in the same manner. Thus going on until we have the 30th. About one hour's

time will be consumed, thirty vials will be used, ten drops of aconite, and an ocean of alcohol of the following dimensions —TWENTY-SEVEN THOUSAND DROPS! which would be equal to a tea-cupful of alcohol!! An ocean of sufficient size to drown all the allopathic candor in the world! So much for the oceans.

At page 67 the Doctor quotes a peculiar oath, as though it was a part and parcel of the homœopathic system. We will admit, with Dr. B., that it is ridiculous and profane, besides being quite unfair *to pin a student down to any set of medical rules*. Yet, Hippocrates administered a solemn oath to his students; and, to come back to modern times, we have an example set us at Edinburgh. *The medical faculty there imposed upon the candidate for graduation, the pledge that he would not adopt the Homœopathic system, recognize its advocates, or, in short, to have anything to do with the "German scheme," under pain of having their diplomas taken from them, and their names excommunicated from the list of regulars!* People who live in glass-houses, etc.

One would judge, from reading the "Delusions," that it was not at all important for homœopathic physicians to possess any knowledge of Anatomy, Physiology, Pathology, etc. —that the Organon was the only text book used.

If the "Evidences" should establish such an impression in the mind of the reader, we trust that he will soon abandon it as false. Our Colleges are as perfect in the collateral branches as those of the old school, and all our societies cause the candidates for membership to pass a rigid examination before they can be received as members. Of course the QUACKS in the homœopathic ranks as well as among the "legitimate" class. *We have known run-away Clerks to swell immensely under the self-assumed title of Doctor, when all they knew of diseases or the action of medicine, was, what they could pick up from a pocket domestic work on practice. Such things are to be expected. They are a species of parasites that attach themselves to the body of a*

healthy system, and suck out its very life. But they are merely an unconscious set of miserable pukes, who will receive their reward in the next world if not in this—no matter whether they have the audacity to call themselves Homœopathic or Allopathic.

If the reader will take the trouble to glance at Dr. Bayard's work, on pages 5, 54 and 60, he will find the word "Dispensary" in small capitals or in italics, as though the venerable author had a peculiar hatred to the word in general, and to the "St. John Public Dispensary," in particular. Perhaps the immortal remains of the "families" defunct hospital scheme has disturbed the ordinary repose of the Doctor's mind. If they failed in their grand ten thousand pound institution, and government patronage, they should not be jealous of their neighbors who have done a good work for the relief of the poor of this city, at a cost of only some £90 per annum. Four hundred poor people have been relieved since the opening of the rooms on the 11th of March last. Their thanks and grateful prayers will avail much more than all the abuse that certain physicians can manufacture. We are positive that our allopathic associate and ourselves have not been guilty of any very heinous crime by devoting one hour each day to those unfortunate persons who are unable to see a physician.

Those capitals betoken no very good feeling, and they seem to say that it has nearly broken the Doctor's heart, to behold Homœopathy recognised in St. John, as a system of medicine worthy of confidence, by a President and Board of Directors who are as capable of distinguishing between right and wrong as Dr. Bayard, and this in a city where, a year ago, Homœopathy was almost unknown; and, as regards the reports which have proceeded from the Homœopathic side of the Dispensary, which he speaks of as "*Dispensary Advertisements*," they are all open for his inspection and criticism any time he may feel disposed to examine them, and, moreover, we would kindly invite the Doctor to visit the institu-

tion, *subscribe one pound* towards its support, and with his own eyes witness the cure of disease by "infinitesimal spiritualized globules!"

That course would be more manly and more professional, and show a greater desire to arrive at the truth, than by turtle-like drawing his head and eyes, yea, and ears, under his shell of hatred and disbelief, and from his dark corner declare Homœopathy a delusion.

Dr. Bayard is not alone in this dispensary feeling, another physician has even made himself ridiculous by his enmity, a man from whom we all expected better things, declaring that he would not counsel with, or recognise Dr. Alward because he attended at the Dispensary from twelve to one o'clock. Such a spirit of insane hatred would disgrace an Arab, much more a medical man, who claims to be a sincere Christian. We trust that some of the *cur-spirited* retailers of jalap will not take the above remarks to themselves. We do not fire at toads when we have more noble game.

We now come to the last immense "evidence" offered by Dr. Bayard, and we will pass it by without much notice, as it is evident to any one that it has no connection with Homœopathy. We allude to the INDICATOR. It seems that Dr. Madden, a homœopathic physician, was among the first to speak of the instrument, hence, Simpson and his imitator endeavor to saddle the thing upon Homœopathy. By the same course of reasoning as that adopted by Dr. Bayard we might conclude that, if a homœopathic man should tumble and break his neck, Homœopathy would be considered shaking in the cervical region. Dr. Bayard is quite careful not to mention any allopathic names in connection with the Indicator, inasmuch as only a *portion* of the truth is wanted for "evidence." However, the Indicator still indicates a certain allopathic condition, and if its pendulum has ceased to vibrate in the gas works at Brighton, its scintillations are perceptible in St. John. For any further light upon this defunct subject we refer the curious reader to the close of

Dr. Bayard's work. It will be there perceived that if Dr. Madden was the first to be deceived by the Indicator, he was also the first to expose its worthlessness.

All allopathic writers, from Leo Wolfe, who wrote that most slanderous work entitled the "The Abracadabra of the Nineteenth Century," in 1835, down to Dr. Bayard, who wrote another slanderous work in 1857, have declared that Homœopathy is dying in Europe and America; but, strange to say, although its dissolution commenced at its birth in 1800, it is still vigorous and strong. Dr. B. speaks of the number of homœopathic physicians in New York city in 1852. Why not tell us of the number in 1857, which is now over two hundred! And in the State of New York there are over one thousand! So much for its death in the United States, where two homœopathic colleges are well sustained.

In England it is progressing with certain advance. The following extract from the N. A. Journal, May, 1857, p. 512, will illustrate its standing in England: "A dispensary, with which Dr. Laurie is connected, was opened in Manchester Square. The Duchess of Cambridge, aunt to the Queen, is patroness of the London Homœopathic Hospital, and her family, when requiring medical service, call in homœopathic attendance. Her daughter was, last summer, under the care of Dr. Quin, a Homœopath. The Duchess of Kent, another royal dowager, is an advocate for Homœopathy. The Queen permits her children to be treated by Dr. Quin; while a close attachment to her old medical attendant, only, prevents her Majesty from adopting Homœopathy.

Dr. Bayard in his preface speaks of a French Physician who does not believe in Homœopathy, no doubt there are many such, neither is there any doubt that many eminent men in France are disciples of Hahnemann. Speaking of Frenchmen reminds us, strange coincidence, of an advertisement which appeared in the *Leader* of June 11th, informing

the good people of St. John that a glorious opportunity existed for them to learn to speak the French language correctly, and heading his notice with the classical saying "*Vita sine literis mors est.*" He gives reference to "all the regular physicians of the *true* school of medicine." The "*Medecin du Peuple*" of "cholera morbus" notoriety and valuable cholera formulas, which are, of course, "*regular*" and "*legitimate*" would not, we suppose impart his knowledge of the French language to any of us *irregular* people, but any person who places himself under the broad banner of "*regular*," no matter what his antecedents may be, is by that act, qualified to judge of the qualifications of a dispenser of French verbs. However, we hope the old gentleman will have a large class, as his "*terms are moderate*" and *references unquestionable*. After reading his advertisement we cannot but exclaim—*Was ist grausamer!*

We have now gone through Dr. Bayard's "Evidences" and found them all—wanting, except in—satire and ridicule. Everest's Sermon, Mure's Pedicules, Louis's Oath, Collyer's Mesmerism, Simpson's Sneers, and the "Lancet's" cuts have all been pressed in as "Evidences." Garbled extracts from Hahnemann's Organon, Jahr's Materia Medica, Dudgeon and Lee serve to—what? A vast array of Arithmetic, oceans of Alcohol, and globes of sugar of milk prove—nothing!

Reflecting persons will employ Homœopathy so long as it performs all it promises, and, moreover, they will advise their friends to give the system a trial, notwithstanding all Dr. B. has said to the contrary. It will not bring them back to Allopathy to tell them they are a set of deluded fools who only imagine themselves cured! Or that the cure is due to the "*vis medicatrix naturæ.*" Or that the medicines they are taking are the most deadly poisons—as one of the regulars declare,—that "*its remedies are inert and powerless,*" as pronounced by another "*legitimate*"—that "*the powders and globules being sweet will soon destroy the teeth*"!! as

wisely said another. Homœopathic patrons require stronger "evidences" than such nonsense before they will throw aside a system of medicine which has given satisfaction. They have taken the "spiritualized infinitesimal globule" and found a certain effect to follow, which resulted in health. If it is a "delusion" or the mere effect of the imagination, why, so be it.

It is certainly preferable to be cured by globules through the mind, than to be put through a "course" of Allopathic "facts and pleasures" in the shape of a couple dozen eight ounce vials, filled with suspicious looking mixtures, which might be composed of some of Hoffman's pleasant remedial agents, such as "De oleo excrementorum" or the renovated musk-bugs which have been suspended "in latrina." The pills, huge and nasty, compounded, perhaps, of moss from the human skull, extract of mummies, with a few earth worms to make them slimy so as to go down easy—and then the blisters—which would make a man feel serious. Oh no! all these contrasted with the minute globule present, at once, a verdict in favor of Homœopathy.

Had we time and space we would like to say something about Allopathic materia medica, and Allopathic pathology etc., we will, perhaps, refer to them particularly next time. but we will give the following anecdote to illustrate Allopathic "wisdom," and Allopathic "progression," and Allopathic "science."

"A young French Doctor, having finished his studies in Paris, went to London to walk the hospitals, as the finishing touch to his professional education. In the course of his observations, his attention was particularly attracted by a patient suffering under a state of high fever. The poor fellow was very persevering in his importunities to the attendant for a broiled red herring, and the medical superintendent, on being applied to as to the propriety of gratifying this wish, considering his case hopeless, directed the attendant to supply the herring. The man ate it with much apparent relish,

to the great admiration of our young Galen, who was extremely curious as to the result. The patient's thirst became intolerable, and he raved for water, which was copiously supplied, on the same principle, viz: if it could do no good, it could not possibly do any harm, as the case was considered hopeless. Strange to say, however, the man recovered, and our young 'legitimate' producing his tablets, indited the following:—'Mem.—Prescribe a red herring for violent fever.' On his return to Paris, having commenced practice, on 'legitimate' principles, he lost no time in turning his valuable discovery to account, and to his first patient in a state of high fever he administered a red herring and the patient died; out came the tablets, and the following was added to its stock of valuable information—'Mem.—A red herring, although it cures an Englishman, kills a Frenchman.'"

Since
of it be
man w
disease
This h
Homes
it was
exceed
retails
eports
a suppo
will gi
tis, as
physic
culars
man h

We
receiv
Wm. 'I
"I

and at
truth

Th

In reg
taugh
durin
not b
and s
disse
the p

APPENDIX.

Since the "Reply" was in press, we have repeatedly heard of it being stated by an Allopathic Physician, that a young man who had been cured by Homœopathy of an osseous disease of the leg had relapsed, and was worse than ever. This he has industriously circulated with a view to injure Homœopathy. In regard to his authority, we can say that, it was stated to him by a person who heard the report in an exceedingly questionable place, yet, the Doctor alluded to, retails the report as true. It is about as true as certain other reports which the same gentleman has tattled in reference to. a supposed absurd mistake in diagnosis. Perhaps the Doctor will give the particulars of *gestation*, *prolapsus* and *urethritis*, as they all existed; and, will also state, if it is a duty a physician owes to a patient or her friends, to blab the particulars of her troubles to the world, as a certain allopathic man has done in this instance.

We publish the following extract from a letter we have received from the father of the young man referred to, Mr. Wm. Thomsom :

"I am justly indignant at the report circulated by Dr. ———, as it has no foundation, inasmuch as my son is well and attending to his usual business, a living testimony of the truth of Homœopathy."

That will put a stopper on one of the allopathic stories. In regard to the other, we can only state that, we have been taught to keep secret whatever we may learn of our patients during our professional intercourse with them, hence, it cannot be publicly explained. Therefore, we will quietly sit and smile as we behold men, learned in blisters and calomel, disseminating a fabricated subterfuge to poison the mind of the public against Homœopathy. *Materiam superat opus.*

ERRATA.

On page 1, 5th line, for "Tonteto," read "touch."

On page 3, 18th line, for "fall," read "face."

On page 12, 5th line from bottom, for "facts," read "fact."

On page 23, for "Anteurieth," read "Autenrieth."

On page 32, for "like many we have seen before him,"
read "as many have done before him."

fact."

him,"